



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/662,474	09/15/2000	Davis Pan	200308310-1	3606

7590

07/21/2005

IP Administration, Legal Department,
M/S 35, Hewlett-Packard Company,
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHEVALIER, ROBERT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2616

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/662,474

Applicant(s)

PAN ET AL.

Examiner

Bob Chevalier

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-14, 16-26, 28-31 and 34-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 15, 27, and 32-33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-26, 28-31, and 34-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-8, 10-14, 16-26, 28-31, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Prasad et al (P.N. 5,675,511).

Prasad et al discloses an apparatus for event tagging for multiple data streams that shows all the limitations recited in claim 1, and 19, including the feature of identifying events within a data stream and generating positional information for the identified events (See Prasad's claim 4), the feature of assigning time-stamp to each event (See the capability of assigning time-stamp to the identified events as shown in Prasad's claim 4), and the feature of correlating data from the first data stream to data in a second data stream based on the time-stamped data pointers as specified in the present claims 1, and 19. (See Prasad's column 7, line 66, to column 8, line 19).

With regard to claims 2, 13, 20, and 31, the feature of the first data stream being a word processing data stream and the second data stream being an audio data stream

as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's column 1, lines 12-14, and lines 30-35).

With regard to claims 3, 21, and 24, the feature of the time-stamped being generated by a common system logger as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's claims 4-5, and 7).

With regard to claims 4, and 22, the feature of the system logger time stamps data in the second data stream as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's claims 4, 7, and column 24, lines 59-60).

With regard to claim 5, the feature of utilizing the data pointers to link events in the first data stream to events in the second data stream as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's column 8, lines 6-11).

With regard to claims 6, and 25, the feature of assigning time-stamps to the events in the first data stream and the second data stream to correlate events in the first data stream with events in the second data stream as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's column 8, lines 6-11, and see, Prasad et al's claims 4-5, and 7).

With regard to claim 7, the feature of identifying an event in the first data stream and locating of a corresponding event in the second data stream using the time-stamps as an index as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's claim 4, and column 8, lines 3-11 column 15, lines 52-67).

With regard to claims 8, and 26, the feature of the time-stamps being generated from a common system clock as specified thereof would be inherently present in the

cited reference of Prasad et al, since, Prasad et al discloses that the event tag further comprises the capability of generating the time stamp for indicating the time for each of the AVD streams.

With regard to claims 10 and 29, the feature of the first data stream being asynchronous as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's column 4, lines 1-3).

With regard to claims 11, 14, and 29, the feature of presenting the first data stream with a time varying playback rate as specified thereof is inherently present Prasad et al. Because, convention reproduction apparatus such as the one shown by Prasad et al would incorporate the capability of playback the recorded data at more than one speed.

With regard to claims 12, and 30, the feature of the event in the first data stream being defined by a fixed passage of time as specified thereof is present in Thong et al. (See Prasad et al's column 4, lines 27-29).

With regard to claims 16, and 34, the feature of the event in the first data stream being random events as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's column 7, lines 11-15).

With regard to claims 17, and 35, the feature of the additional data streams in which events are correlated as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. ((See Prasad's column 7, line 66, to column 8, line 19).

With regard to claims 18, and 36, the feature of the first and second data stream being recorded in a storage device for later retrieval and the corresponding data

pointers indicate a location of a corresponding event recorded in the storage device as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's column 1, lines 11-19, and column 2, lines 12-24).

With regard to claim 23, the feature of the first and second event detector for identifying events in a first and second data stream as specified thereof is present in Prasad et al. (See Prasad et al's claim 4).

4. Claims 9, 15, 27, and 32-33, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bob Chevalier whose telephone number is 571-272-7374. The examiner can normally be reached on MM-F (9:00-6:30), second Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Groody can be reached on 571-272-7950. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

B. Chevalier
July 13, 2005.


ROBERT CHEVALIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER